

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-2, 4, 12-13, 15, 23-24, 26 and 34-42 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-2, 4, 12-13, 15, 23-24, 26 and 34-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Gerace U.S. Patent No. 5,848,396 ("Gerace").

II. Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants have amended claims 1, 12 and 23 to more particularly define the claimed invention, and have amended claim 39 to correct an informality. Applicants' claim amendments do not introduce any new matter and are fully supported by the originally-filed specification (see, e.g., p. 21, l. 5-p. 22, l. 7).

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in light of the following remarks.

III. Summary of Telephonic Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the May 31, 2005 telephonic interview with the undersigned. During the interview, claim 1 was discussed. In particular, the features of first "providing the user with an opportunity to select at least

one television-related information source from a plurality of television-related information sources," and then "providing the user with an opportunity to specify criteria for delivering information from the at least one selected television-related information source," were discussed. Applicants disagree with the Examiner that Gerace shows these features. But in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this application, applicants have amended independent claims 1, 12 and 23.

IV. Applicants' Reply to the § 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4, 12-13, 15, 23-24, 26 and 34-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Gerace. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.

Applicants' claimed invention, as recited in independent claims 1, 12 and 23, is directed to a method and systems for providing a user with personalized schedule information. The user may select a television-related information source and specify first criteria for delivering television program listings from the selected television-related information source. The user may also select a non-television-related information source and specify second criteria for delivering schedule information for non-

televised events from the selected non-television-related information source. The user may further select a delivery scheme for delivering personalized schedule information. The personalized schedule information includes the television program listings, "at least one video or video still related to one of the television program listings," and the schedule information for non-televised events (claims 1, 12 and 23, emphasis added).

The Examiner contends that Gerace shows every feature of applicants' independent claims 1, 12 and 23. In particular, the Examiner points to col. 9, ll. 8-30, col. 10, l. 9-col. 11, l. 42, col. 17, ll. 18-52, col. 22, ll. 43-52 and col. 26, ll. 40-63 of Gerace.

Contrary to the Examiner's contention, Gerace does not show every feature of applicants' claimed invention. In particular, Gerace does not show delivering personalized schedule information that has television program listings, "at least one video or video still related to one of the television program listings," and information for non-televised events to the user, as required by independent claims 1, 12 and 23 (emphasis added).

Gerace is directed to providing a data assembly for displaying customized agate information to a computer user,

and a tracking and profiling member for recording user activity with respect to a gate information displayed through the data assembly (col. 2, ll. 6-15). The user may display a Media-Page having three tables of information (television listings, film listings, and live performance listings) (col. 10, ll. 9-22), which the user may "search for a specific show or film (to see where and when it is playing) or national network/satellite channel" (col. 22, ll. 44-48). But Gerace does not show or suggest displaying a Media-Page having television program listings based on first criteria, a video or video still related to one of the television program listings, and schedule information for non-televised events based on second criteria, as required by applicants' independent claims 1, 12, and 23. Accordingly, Gerace does not show or suggest every feature of applicants' amended independent claims 1, 12 and 23.

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1, 12 and 23 are allowable over Gerace. Claims 2, 4, 13, 15, 24, 26 and 34-42, which depend from one of independent claims 1, 12 and 23, are therefore also allowable over Gerace. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-2, 4, 12-13, 15, 23-24, 26 and 34-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, prompt reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Evelyn C. Mak

Evelyn C. Mak
Reg. No. 50,492
Attorney for Applicants
Fish & Neave IP Group
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
(212) 596-9000